

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 21 are canceled. New claims 22 to 39 are added. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are moot in view of the new claims, which distinguish over the cited art.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY:

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview, which was held on January 8, 2010, between Examiner Michael Le and Applicants' representatives, Robert Hails and John Gillick. During the call, possible amendments to overcome the section 112 and section 101 rejections, which could be entered After Final, were discussed. Further, a discussion of the prior art and interpretation of subject matter was discussed. The Examiner indicated that the amendments included herein would overcome the currently cited prior art, subject to further searching.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Office Action objects to the specification because "the computer readable medium recited in claims 14-18 is not mentioned in the Specification and is therefore not supported." Applicants respectfully point to Fig. 5 and associated paragraph 29, where at least three computer readable mediums are disclosed (e.g., 522, 524, and 526), providing antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter, "computer readable medium." Applicants therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 21 was objected to as containing informalities. Claim 21 has been canceled, rendering the rejection moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim objection is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 8 has been canceled rendering the rejection moot. Analogous claim 28 does not include the allegedly indefinite terms. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1 to 8 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1 to 8 and 21 have been canceled, rendering the rejections moot. Analogous new claims further clarify the use of a computer processor, which is a statutory class. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 101 rejections.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND NEW CLAIMS

Claims 1 to 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Moraes et al. (US patent Pub. No. 2005/0033777) (Moraes).

Claims 1 to 19 and 21 have been canceled, rendering the rejections moot. New claims 22 to 39 distinguish over the prior art for at least the following reasons.

New Claims 22-29 Define over the Cited Art

Claim 22 recites, in part:

a computer system including one or more hardware processor(s) executing program instructions to instantiate:

one or more analyzers, executed by the processor, to read data entries from the database according to respective read requests and to **calculate analytical results therefrom;**

a data flow manager, responsive to read requests from the analyzers, to store data representing the read requests in a read history, the stored data including, for each read request, **identifiers of a data entry read and an analytical result generated therefrom;** and

a correction server, responsive to a write to a data entry in the database to correct that data entry, to:

compare an identifier of the corrected data entry to data entry identifiers stored in the read history and,

when a match occurs, identify a previously-generated analytical result corresponding to the matching data entry identifier of the read history as rendered potentially inconsistent by the data entry correction.

Moraes generally describes a system where “changes are organized as change sessions in a change history database and tagged with user-provided reasons and other identification fields.” Moraes et al. Abstract. Further, Moraes “provides detailed access to change history and selection of specific changes and items in order to analyze effects of changes, diagnose problems caused by changes, compare changes and change history, rollback from changes to previous item contents or package sets of changes to be repeated.” This is quite distinct from the features of

claim 22, which includes “one or more analyzers . . . to read data entries from [a] database according to respective read requests and to **calculate analytical results therefrom.**” Unlike Moraes, this new “analytical result” is not a replacement for the “read data entr[y],” but was read in conjunction with creating a new analytical result.

Claim 22 also includes “a data flow manager . . . to store . . . identifiers of a data entry read and an analytical result generated therefrom.” Thus, “responsive to a write to a data entry in the database to correct that data entry,” claim 22 will “identify a previously-generated analytical result corresponding to the matching data entry identifier [of the corrected data entry] as rendered potentially inconsistent.” Thus, each “analytical result” that is based on a corrected data entry is identified as potentially inconsistent. This is wholly unrelated to the Moraes system that essentially records all changes so that rollbacks can occur.

For at least these reasons claim 22 should be allowed. Dependent claims 23 to 29 should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

New Claims 30-39 Define over the Cited Art

Claim 30 recites, in part:

responsive to each of a plurality of read requests to a database
by analyzers to process database data entries, storing with a computer
hardware processor, in a read history:

an identifier of the data entry being read pursuant to the read request
and

an identifier of **an analytical result generated by the respective
analyzer after having processed the data entry,**

responsive to a write operation to the database to correct a data
entry therein:

comparing with the computer hardware processor an identifier
of the corrected data entry to data entry identifiers stored in the read
history, and

*when a match occurs, identifying a previously-generated
analytical result corresponding to the matching data entry identifier of the
read history as rendered potentially inconsistent by the data entry
correction.*

Moraes generally describes a system where “changes are organized as change sessions in a change history database and tagged with user-provided reasons and other identification fields.” Moraes at Abstract. Further, Moraes “provides detailed access to change history and selection of specific changes and items in order to analyze effects of changes, diagnose problems caused

by changes, compare changes and change history, rollback from changes to previous item contents or package sets of changes to be repeated.” This is quite distinct from the features of claim 30, which include storing a read history identifying database values and analytical results based in part on those values, such that when a correction occurs, analytical results can be identified as potentially inconsistent.

For at least these reasons claims 30 and 34 should be allowed. Dependent claims 31 to 33 and 35 to 37 should be allowed for at least the same reasons. Claims 38 and 39 recite at least features similar to the above discussed claims, and should be allowed for at least analogous reasons.

CONCLUSION

All outstanding objections have been overcome. It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is in clear condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Although not believed necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

The Office is invited to contact the undersigned at 212-425-7200 to discuss any matter regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 28, 2010

/John B. Gillick, Jr./

John B. Gillick, Jr.

Registration No. 63,027

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200 telephone
(212) 425-5288 facsimile